DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 127 689 EA 008 605

AUTHOR Willower, Donald J.
TITLE Theory in Educational Administration.
INSTITUTION University Council for Educational Administration, Columbus, Ohio.
PUB DATE Jul 75
NOTE 10p.; Reprint from UCEA Review; v16 n5 Jul 1975

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$1.67 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Educational Administration; Educational Research; *Educational Theories; *Literature Reviews; *Models; *Organization; *Research Methodology; Theories

ABSTRACT

This brief essay on theory in educational administration examines the state of the art in general terms. No effort is made to provide a comprehensive or substantive review of theories or the research associated with them, although some attention is given to those topics. The essay's major concerns are with the particulars of theory development and use in educational administration, the problems of theory development in educational administration, and some strategies of theory development. (Author/IRT)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED127689

THE UNIVERSITY COUNCIL FOR EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION
UCEA Review

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

THEORY IN EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION

by
Donald J. Willower
The Pennsylvania State University

This brief essay on theory in educational administration examines the state of the art in general terms. No effort has been made to provide a comprehensive or substantive review of theories or the research associated with them, although some attention is given those topics.

While much has been written about the "theory movement" in educational administration, there has been no serious epistemological debate. That is, no explicit proposals have been made to replace the scientific-empirical theory of knowledge that undergirds current efforts to understand educational administration with one based on faith, intuition, or authority. Nor does it seem likely that such proposals will be advanced. As I argued elsewhere,[1] the ascendancy of a more scientific approach in educational administration represents a maturation of the field rather than a temporary fashion, and even though theory from time to time will be given

EDITORS' INTRODUCTION

On March 31, 1975, a UCEA-sponsored Symposium called "Trends in Educational Administration" was held at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association in Washington, D. C.

The goal of the Symposium was to provide an update for interested persons in four major areas of the field: theory, research, training programs and practice. Because the Symposium format allowed too little time for the complete presentation of prepared papers, UCEA is presenting the complete papers in this issue of *The UCEA Review* in order that persons who heard the abridged symposium versions or who could not be in attendance can study the papers presented. Symposium discussants' comments are also included here because they add an important perspective on the papers presented.

There are many ways to assess and synthesize the field of Educational Administration, only one of which is to think "trends". Similarly, there are many "trends" other than those falling into areas called theory, research, training and practice. The papers and discussants' remarks do, in fact, branch off into other ways of thinking about and assessing the field, but we invite the readers of this issue of *The UCEA Review* to inform us of their own alternative views so that a wider range of perspectives can be made a part of the offering of this journal in the months ahead.

We are appreciative of the efforts of the authors to prepare final versions of their papers in time for summer publication and are pleased to make the content of the Symposium available to Professors and Students of Educational Administration in UCEA Universities.

Frederick P. Frank
Paula F. Silver

UCEA *Review*

Published bi-monthly, by the University Council for Educational Administration, 29 West Woodruff Avenue, Columbus, Ohio 43210. Distributed without charge to professors, administrators, and advanced graduate students of educational administration in UCEA member universities.

Jack Culbertson	UCEA Executive Director
Paula Silver	UCEA Associate Director and *Review* Editor
Frederick P. Frank	UCEA Associate Director and Co-Editor of this issue
Betty Patterson	Secretary

Please address all contributions and inquiries to the Editor, *UCEA Review*, The University Council for Educational Administration, The Ohio State University, 29 West Woodruff Avenue, Columbus, Ohio 43210.

EA 008 605

different degrees of emphasis in the literature on educational administration, I do not foresee a fundamental backtracking.[2]

Such disenchantment with theory as may exist seems to stem from unrealistically high expectations for quick infusions of new knowledge via theory based research, on the one hand, and from concern about the difficulties of applying theory to practice, on the other hand.

With regard to the former, it can be said that Rome was not built in one day, and it might be added, it will never be finished. It is trite but true that theory building and testing require time and effort, and are tasks that are always incomplete. While progress in theory development in educational administration has been slow, it has been tangible. Even a cursory comparison of current literature in educational administration with that prior to 1955 reveals a striking contrast. The recent work is much more conceptual and more tough minded; the earlier work is virtually atheoretical with strong tendencies toward prescription.

With respect to the theory-practice relationship, it cannot be denied that efforts to apply theory to practice in educational administration are beset with pitfalls, as they are in every field of endeavor where such efforts are made. The problems arise for a number of reasons, among them the nature of universities and schools as social systems, their distinctive environments and the manner in which these institutions adapt to them, the divergent languages and values characteristic of theorists and practitioners, as well as their respective orientations toward reflection and action, and the parsimony and special focus of particular theories in contrast with the complexity and unbounded richness of life in public school organizations.

However, even if educational administration had not become more theory oriented, tensions between ideas and their application and between universities and schools would still exist. The injunction to forget "theory" and be practical is an echo from the distant past, often applied to opinions, philosophies, and desirable but difficult strategies of practice, as well as to theory.

Dissatisfaction with theory that emanates from excessive expectations or from frustrations with practical applications is chronic and essentially incurable. In part, this is a matter of both the standards applied and the sentiments of the appliers. If panaceas or even great leaps forward are expected, not only the field of educational administration but all of the social science and applied fields will be littered with fumbled torches.[3]

In any case, wringing hands are likely to fumble and prolonged debates over how well or badly we're doing have low utility. It is more productive to examine in what ways and why theory and practice are disconnected and how they could be better conjoined,[4] and to explore some of the particulars of theory development and use in educational administration. I turn now to the latter topic.

Variation, Fragments, and Thrusts

Definitions of theory range from those that are quite rigorous to those that are much more pliable. Feigl's definition of theory as "a set of assumptions from which empirical laws are derivable by logico-mathematical deduction"[5] sets a standard that would exclude virtually everything done in educational administration to date. A somewhat more inclusive definition views theory as a body of interrelated, consistent generalizations that serves to explain. However, even this formulation eliminates a good portion of what could be called conceptually based work in educational administration. Writing about sociological theory, Merton stated that a large part of what is called theory "consists of general orientations toward data, suggesting types of variables which theories must somehow take into account rather than clearly formulated, verifiable statements of relationships between specified variables."[6] The notion of orientations toward data is, of course, loose enough to accommodate much of the work in educational administration.

However, in contrast with sociology, and in spite of its use as a straw man by some writers, there has been no real effort to construct a "grand theory" of educational administration. Thus, the highly abstract, large scale theory without operational focus that Merton actually referred to above has not been an issue, except when borrowed from a grand theorist. Instead, reasonably clear formulations of relationships between variables lacking explicit connection to a body of theoretical propositions have been more typical.

In any case, given a definition of theory loose enough to be fairly inclusive, the picture in educational administration is one of great variation. The social science disciplines and the fledgling "science of administration" have been sources of most of the theoretical ideas used or discussed in educational administration.

Some theoretical approaches that have been well developed in a discipline have been used quite directly to guide empirical work in educational administration. Role theory is an example. Some frameworks that have been explicitly formulated have been discussed in educational administration but used only sparingly. James D. Thompson's propositions on organizational adaptation serve as an example. Some general theoretical approaches find fairly specific application. Social system theory leading to work on norms, status systems or socialization in school organizations illustrates this. Some general approaches are cited frequently but the connections between them and the empirical work done are cloudy. The use of David Easton's systems theory in work on the politics of education is an example. Some theories that have been employed appear to be flawed in their application to educational organizations. Bureaucratic theory is a case in point. Some theoretical approaches are

more fragmented than others and bits and pieces have been used in educational administration. Leadership theory falls in this category.

As has been implied, theoretical presentations in related fields vary widely in mode and clarity of expression. Some are written with attention to the explication of assumptions, concepts, generalizations, and the interconnection of propositions. Others are just written and the reader is left to puzzle over and perhaps ferret out theoretical structure hidden by dense prose camouflage.[7]

At any rate, while there is plenty of room for argument over the examples given, the point is that theoretical packages come in a variety of sizes and shapes and some have been opened and others have not. Moreover, most of the approaches are conceptually oriented fragments, not integrated packages.

Since Bidwell's incisive review on the school as a formal organization,[8] there have been two others, one by Griffiths,[9] and one by Corwin,[10] that have examined theories as they apply to educational organizations.

Griffiths divided the "administrative theory" treated in his review into four categories. One consisted of the work of J. W. Getzels and others on social system and role theory, one dealt with leadership theory, especially that operationalized via the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire, in another, decision-making theory was examined, and the fourth category encompassed organization theory, largely in classical management terms. Griffiths' analysis was primarily directed to work in educational administration rather than to a broader arena. His categories readily accommodate most of the studies selected by Halpin as substantive contributions in educational administration prior to 1964. The five studies Halpin chose were those of Getzels, the work of Hemphill, Griffiths, and Frederiksen on administrative performance in the principalship, Carlson's investigation of succession, and his own research on leadership behavior, and organizational climate.[11]

Looking at work within educational administration from a later time perspective, it is no longer the case that only a few inquiries stand out as landmarks. There has been an increase in serious scholarship with substantive conceptual underpinnings. However, it remains true that most of it is better labeled theoretically oriented than theory.

It is not possible to mention everything done in educational administration that has theoretical utility, but a few thrusts or types of inquiry will be cited. Getzels' version of role theory and much of the work done in connection with it now has been elaborated in a single source.[12] Griffiths indicated in his review that research based on Getzels' ideas has been falling off,[13] and Corwin found an appreciable decline in publications on role theory in two major sociology journals;[14] a rough scan of the dissertation abstracts and several relevant journals of the past two years indicates that the Getzels' framework continues to guide only a few studies in educational administration. Halpin's work on leadership behavior and especially on organizational climate remains the basis of a fairly large number of investigations. The availability of instruments to measure these variables undoubtedly has contributed to their popularity, especially in dissertation research.

The studies of Gross and Herriott and their associates on the principalship constitute another notable effort.[15] The concept of executive professional leadership and an operational definition for the concept were developed in this work.[16]

The inquiries that some of us have been pursuing on pupil control and its place in the school's social system have resulted in more than 90 studies to date.[17] Here, also, the development of measures, one on educator pupil control ideology and one on educator pupil control behavior, have spurred research efforts. A feature of this work is that it stemmed from a field study that suggested the importance of pupil control in schools.

A number of field studies have examined aspects of school life. Cusick's study of a high school, the work of Iannaccone and Lutz on the school board-superintendent relationship, that of Smith and Keith on an innovative elementary school, and Wolcott's observations of a school principal are examples.[18] These studies vary in the extent to which they have been informed by theory. However, most of them carry conceptual baggage and all of them abound in what might be called fragments of theoretical interest.

Field studies as well as more traditional methods have been utilized in the line of work on the process of instructional and organizational change being conducted at the University of Oregon.[19] It has examined the task structures of teaching, as well as teacher autonomy and participation in decision-making. Another kind of approach to change is represented by the adoption-diffusion tradition illustrated by Carlson's investigation.[20]

Bidwell contended that schools display "at least in rudimentary form" the characteristics associated with ideal type bureaucracy,[21] and there have been a number of studies of schools that have been based on bureaucratic theory.[22] However, the standard features of bureaucracy appear to apply unevenly to schools, a problem that has received at least some attention.[23]

The empirical thrusts listed represent the kind of efforts that could lay the groundwork for theory development in educational administration. Another mode of work that could be a source of theory, but which has not been so far in educational administration, is the book that seeks conceptual integration or formulates an original theory. Examples from related fields can be found for the former in March and Simon, and for the latter in Etzioni or Thompson.[24] Two serious efforts in the latter direction in educational administration are by Walton[25] and by McGrath.[26]

Bidwell's review and analysis of the school as a formal

organization are an attempt "to move toward a formulation of the organizational character of schools,"[27] and while it was theoretically eclectic, it was an important contribution to the literature on theory in educational administration. The same can be said of Corwin's examination of models of organization which is considered next.[28]

Corwin proposed and implemented a strategy for advancing theoretical work on educational organizations. It consisted of the identification and analytical examination of models of organization that describe patterns of relationship among a number of key variables. Although he referred to the models as inductive, he contrasted this approach with systematic empirical theory and noted that models are designed a priori.

Following Gouldner, the rational model and the natural systems model were designated "primary models." The rational model was discussed basically in terms of bureaucratic theory but decision-making and what was called the industrial relations model, apparently classical management theory, were described as versions of the rational model.

The natural systems model explores deviations from, or unintended consequences of ideal type rationality, in Page's term, bureaucracy's other face.[29] Corwin discussed concepts such as autonomy, influence, and power and argued that both primary models suffer limitations in their application to schools. For example, the natural systems model was described as better applying to higher participants than to the rank and file. A reconciliation of the models was suggested that involved examination of the organizational and environmental conditions that differentially influence integrating mechanisms. An example of an integrating mechanism is centralized power and an example of an organizational condition is number of hierarchical levels. Slippage in the application of power was viewed as more likely to occur in organizations with many levels than in those with fewer levels.

A second set of primary models considered by Corwin were termed open and closed models of organization. The latter concentrates on internal organizational features and ignores external circumstances, while the former includes environmental variables. Arguing that most organizations range somewhere between the polar types represented by the four primary models, Corwin then considered a number of "derivative" models. These included organic models represented by social system, functional, cybernetic, and equilibration and exchange versions, conflict models, and role models. The complex organization model, depicted largely in the work of James D. Thompson, was seen as a potential source of synthesis, apparently because structural shifts at various points in the organization in response to uncertainty could sometimes be viewed as characteristic of one of the primary models, and sometimes characteristic of another. Corwin concluded his essay with an analysis of three types of organizational constraints; those that arise from the environment, technology, and organizational size.

Corwin's approach to educational organizations is noteworthy in that it begins with broad theoretical categories and uses relevant speculation and empirical studies to advance new propositions. While some writers employ rational and closed system models as straw men, Corwin avoids that and makes explicit limitations and advantages of each of the models considered. The models often are not mutually exclusive in the sense that certain ideas can be subsumed under several of them. For example, the notion that organizations behave in ways that reduce uncertainty can be comfortably incorporated in both the open and natural systems models, all of the versions of the organic model, and is central to the complex organization model, as well as to treatments of environmental and technological constraints.

In any case, this work represents an important effort to spell out the implications for educational organizations of several general theoretical orientations. Moreover, the strategy employed differs from some that have been proposed, a point I will return to later.

This exploration of fragments, thrusts, and critical analyses, like most unspecified treatments of theory in educational administration, has been restricted to theories about educational organization. Economic theories applied to schooling have been completely omitted and the applications of political theories have been considered only tangentially,[30] both fields that Walker sees as growing in importance.[31] Areas that are properly thought of as dealing with technique rather than theory have, of course, also been excluded. Futurology, organizational development, and systems theory provide examples of areas that largely fall in this category. Although there are some exceptions,[32] writing on systems theory in educations seems to involve a bow in the direction of philosophic organicism conjoined with the promotion of a plethora of management techniques. This is unfortunate since systems theory includes a host of ideas of potentially high theoretical utility.

Next, some of the problems of theory development in educational administration are considered.

Philosophy of Science, Logistics, and Strategies

A number of the issues connected with theory development are of the philosophy of science variety. These deal with such topics as the forms of theoretical expression, the nature of theoretical systems and their parts, levels of abstraction, and evidence or the matter of confirmation and rejection, all interwoven with the question of what constitutes adequate theory.

The forms taken by theoretical expression have been much discussed, perhaps lamented is a better term, in the social sciences. Zetterberg's call for a propositional

sociology,[33] and Homans' emphasis on deductive systems[34] are illustrative.

In educational administration, these topics have been given scant attention. The issues are essentially those of clarity of theoretical expression, and the logic governing the relationships among a theory's constituent elements. The former requires that the variables that are part of a theory be explicitly defined and the nature of the relationship they bear to other variables be unambiguous, as in the proposition "if p increases, then q increases." It is not inherently difficult to do this and work in educational administration has not been more deficient in this regard than that in other fields. The question of the interconnection of the parts of a theory or its coherence is more complex, but it is essentially a matter of the ordering of theoretical propositions. This can be done in the form of postulates and theorems to use one kind of terminology, but it must be accomplished deductively. The use of symbols and quantitative terms may facilitate deduction under certain conditions, but such devices are not necessary and should not be equated with deduction, which requires manipulation according to the rules of a particular logic.

That kind of theoretical expression is much praised but little used in the social sciences, not to mention educational administration. Even Getzels' framework which appears to be a relatively coherent one has not been presented in this fashion, although hopotheses derived from that theory often are based on the substitution of lower order abstractions for concepts on a higher level, as when the proposition, "Effectiveness is a function of the congruence of expectations and behavior," becomes "The teacher's estimate of his own effectiveness is a function of the congruence of the principal's expectations for teacher behavior as perceived by the teacher and the teacher's behavior as reported by himself."[35]

In any case, if educational administration can be gauged by what has transpired in other fields, more attention of a general sort will be paid to deduction and a few writers will venture theoretical presentations that strive for deductive clarity, but logical structure will continue to be implicit rather than explicit in the bulk of theoretical work. This is not catastrophe in the conceptual realm and it does not mean that theoretical gains of high quality will not be achieved. It does mean that anyone interested in the logical framework upon which a theory hangs will have to learn excavation, and it may mean that some theorists are practicing construction without blueprints.

However, a more immediate problem arises when theoretical connections are vague. The extent to which the test of a hypothesis also furnishes evidence on a theory depends on the closeness of logical connection between the two. Hence, even though a hypothesis may share a concept with a body of theory, unless the hypothesis is derived, that is, deduced from the theory, evidence on the hypothesis is not evidence on the theory.

Admittedly, comments on theory construction that stress formal procedures have a shadowy quality when applied to a field that has just begun to develop conceptually. There is virtually nothing that can serve as an example of success or even provide a clear illustration of effort. This misty quality still pertains although somewhat less so with regard to the question of criteria of theoretical adequacy. Some years ago I applied such criteria, taken from the literature, to Getzels' framework.[36] The criteria employed were testability, coherence or logical consistency, scope, predictive power, fruitfulness, and parsimony. Even though Getzels theory was perhaps the most explicitly developed scheme in use in educational administration at the time, the exercise was far from satisfactory. It was necessary to make judgments based on rough estimations and the possibility that others might come to different conclusions could not be discounted. However, the application of such criteria to some other "theories" was more clear cut. It frequently was not possible even to discuss them in such terms because of their lack of development.

The situation today is somewhat more promising. We have begun to use more well developed theories from the social sciences, and within the field, as Griffiths put it, "the work necessary for theory building in the future is underway."[37] In any case, although some of the philosophy of science concerns discussed may seem distant from the more immediate problems of theory building and research in educational administration, they serve as a reminder of matters that may become more salient as the field becomes more sophisticated.

Next, I want to comment on what I call logistical type issues in theory development in educational administration. These deal with who does theoretical work and what conditions are influential in this regard.

In separate papers, both Halpin and Iannaccone[38] decried opportunism in educational administration that stemmed from lavish funding available for studies that followed fads, but were otherwise useless. Both observed a small cadre of theoretically oriented scholars at work during times that featured dilentantism, grantsmanship, and the popular but superficial idea. Their criticisms were well founded. Yet, among the leading figures in at least the university world of educational administration are the very scholars described by Halpin and Iannaccone. And, in spite of themselves, both of these men fall into that category. Meanwhile, the number of persons involved in conceptually oriented work and especially in related empirical studies in educational administration has been increasing as several generations of students prepared in programs that stress theory and research have been produced.

However, it is still true that theory building and research are not first priorities in the bulk of educational administration departments or for the vast majority of professors. Campbell and Newell reported that only 11 per cent of the professors of educational administration

they surveyed ranked research and writing as of first importance, and only 2 per cent spent 50 per cent or more of their time in that kind of activity.[39] In addition, the sharp reduction in funds available for the support of research is bound to result in the loss of at least some conceptual capital along with the dross.

The pursuit of fads and trivia continues to consume considerable energy. Recent attention given the matter of competencies is only one example. Since our field has a firing line as well as an ivory tower, it tends to be both sensitive to and responsive to a variety of immediate and sometimes crisis borne demands that stem from the pressing problems of the moment. In such a context, relevance and scholarship may seem to be at odds. When theory fails to provide quick answers to complex problems, impatience goaded by frustration takes over, and the faint hearted give up on theory and retool those relics of a more naive time, the slogan and the recipe.

Countering features include the just mentioned emergence of a group of able younger scholars oriented toward theory, and the fact that relevance is a two edged sword. It is two edged in the sense that an effort to make a theoretical contribution to educational administration could well be a discipline based scholar's version of relevance.

Given the multi-purpose character of departments of educational administration, I expect that the number and distribution of individuals within the field who are engaged in theoretical work will continue to be such that the much discussed critical mass[40] will rarely be achieved. However, critical masses seem more appropriate for large scale empirical studies than for theory building.

In summary, there are more workers in the theory vineyards than before, but still not very many; they tend to be dispersed rather than concentrated, but that does not pose a major problem; and the environment continues to feature constraints as well as facilitators. On balance, it appears that theory based work in our field will continue at a slow but deliberate pace. Of course, as more is produced, opportunities to build upon or revise past efforts are enhanced.

In the final section of this paper, strategies for theory development in educational administration are explored. I recognize that those who build and test theories are an individualistic lot, so the strategies enumerated are merely suggestive. For the most part, they exhibit a favorable cost-benefit ratio; that is, they represent low cost activities that could contribute to theory development in educational administration, an important point in hard times.

The strategy that Corwin followed was to identify several models or theories of organization and to examine them to unearth neglected variables, suggest gaps, and propose useful variables and hypotheses.[41] In the main, he began with broad theories and worked toward lower levels of abstraction, but when possible, he looked to empirical studies for clues.

This top down strategy contrasts sharply with that proposed by Iannaccone who cogently argued for an approach that stresses and respects the subject matter of educational administration by attending to the empirical world of the school organization.[42] He saw field studies as a source of concepts and explanations that could furnish a basis for genuine theoretical advance *in educational administration.* He further contended that this type of inquiry, which has high potential for both theoretical and practical relevance, was constrained by the narrow experimental conception of research that dominates education.

I share Iannaconne's concerns, but we are not faced with an either-or situation. Both of the strategies can contribute to theoretical advance. In fact, the only appropriate stance toward such strategies is that of the inquirer. Any strategy or method that abets the construction of explanations about educational organizations should be valued and encouraged.

However, strategies vary in their difficulty and in the resources they require. The approach employed by Corwin requires the background and time necessary to become well grounded in various theories and the talent to draw out their implications. It is essentially an activity that attempts to build creatively on the work of others. This is a very large order, but it does not require the material resources necessary for a careful field study.

That endeavor demands an immersion in data over a lengthy period of time, one of the reasons, incidentally, why doctoral students in search of dissertation topics typically eschew field studies. Moreover, field studies ordinarily are facilitated when several investigators can explore together the meaning of data and tease out possible concepts and explanations; in this kind of probe sounding boards foster conceptual analysis.

While the full fledged field study obviously is the preferred mode, I would like to suggest some simpler variants that can provide field type data which might have theoretical utility. I call one such strategy the experience audit. The audit is written by a participant at a time after the events described have taken place. An objective is to blend description with at least some conceptual analysis. I have employed this device with graduate students who draw on their experience as teachers or administrators and with undergraduates who usually draw on their experience as public school students. The experience audit is much narrower than the field study. Commonly, its focus is only one or a few features of school life such as principal-teacher relations, decision-making in the administrative cabinet meeting, or behavior in a special setting such as the assembly or teachers' lounge. The particular focus of the audit is selected because prior discussions suggest that it is potentially interesting from a theoretical standpoint.

Another variation is the log or diary kept by a participant over a period of time. Logs kept by a new principal or superintendent or by a teacher involved in the

implementation of a new instructional system are examples. The log is more likely than the audit to catalog events as they unfold. However, it is also narrow and limited to the perspective of a single participant. Both audits and logs can benefit from sounding board type discussions while in progress and, like field studies, both furnish descriptions and perhaps some useful concepts and hypotheses, not conclusions. These strategies seem to me to be potentially helpful proxies for more extensive field studies. In this connection, recall Waller's use of student papers in his analysis of the school as a miniature society[43] and Homan's comment that "no one will go far wrong theoretically who remains in close touch with and seeks to understand a body of concrete phenomena."[44]

Field studies are based on observations of behavior. Another style of research employs instruments that function as operational definitions for certain kinds of behavior or attitudes, indirect measures that are common in educational research. The use of such devices in an intensive comparative mode constitutes another strategy that could lead to the extraction of theoretically useful hypotheses. Charters' analysis of the responses to a battery of instruments of the faculties of two schools, one undergoing a change in work arrangements and one not undergoing such a change, approaches what I have in mind.[45]

However, concerns about sampling adequacy and the dangers of analyses based on a small number of responses to an array of instruments seem to constrain this kind of effort, so that it is rarely undertaken, let alone reported. As with field studies, inhibitions stem from the scientist's interest in precision and aversion to extravagant claims. Yet, the development of ideas is not the same as testing them, and the critical stance required for the latter stands in tension with the creative one appropriate to the former. As Iannaccone pointed out, we have rigorously tested a lot of poor ideas in educational administration.[46] We still neglect what Mooney called the private half of the research act, having to do with the derivation of a significant question or hypothesis.[47]

Another strategy that employs instruments of the paper and pencil variety involves the construction of such devices to measure concepts that are central to explanation in a given area. This is what we sought in the work on pupil control. Inquiry in the field study mode suggested that pupil control was a concept that was important in understanding schools, and the instruments constructed to tap educator pupil control ideology and behavior then facilitated a cumulative research undertaking that provided a wide range of findings on the part played by pupil control in educational organizations. Instruments that operationally define other concepts central to educational administration easily could become vehicles for similar kinds of cumulative efforts.

Another type of strategy is based on the use of a variety of techniques in theory construction. This strategy subsumes a number of methodological tactics geared to the formulation of concepts and propositions that lend themselves to theoretical manipulation and exposition. An excellent treatment of these theory building tactics is found in Hage.[48] The techniques employed range from those that seek to create variables and continuous statements from constants and either-or statements to those that specify and order the concepts, definitions, statements, and linkages seen as integral to the construction of theory. The techniques cover a sufficiently wide spectrum so that they can be applied to theoretical work in various stages of development. Hence, they have utility for a field that is beginning to develop conceptually as well as for one that is more advanced.

A strategy that is somewhat more traditional is to look to the various disciplines and thoroughly mine a specific theory or the work of a particular theorist. I recognize that a fair amount of this sort of thing has already been done, but it ordinarily has not been accomplished in a painstaking and exhaustive manner. Exchange theory and systems theory of the cybernetic variety are examples of specific theories that would be good candidates for such an exercise. The works of James Thompson and Etzioni have already been mentioned as sources of theory that could be applied to educational organizations, and there are many others including such older and now classic sources as Charles Horton Cooley and George Herbert Mead.

The strategies cited are neither mutually exclusive nor is the list all inclusive. The use of advanced technological aids such as the computer which can furnish simulations of school organizations to explore decision-making and other theories in a controlled setting is an example of an omission. The proposed strategies are plain and direct. They simply suggest ways of drawing ideas from experience, data, or what others have written, and of expressing them in an orderly fashion.

Codification and synthesis are additional activities that could greatly contribute to theoretical advance. Codification deals with the explication of theoretical components, and also seeks to systematize available empirical generalizations in different spheres.[49] Synthesis, on the other hand, is an attempt to reconcile and blend different theories that treat similar phenomena.[50] As theoretical work and empirical investigations accumulate, codification and synthesis ordinarily become more essential.

In any case, any one of the strategies and activities discussed could form the basis for a professional lifetime of endeavor on the part of individual students of educational administration, the more so because theory building and empirical studies are so frequently intertwined.

However, barring some unforeseen trend,[51] circumstances are such that a limited number of professors of educational administration will contribute to theoretically oriented work in their own field. A comprehensive examination of educational

administration from a sociology of knowledge perspective would be revealing; however, it seems clear that university departments of educational administration are characterized by multiple and wide ranging aims that spawn scattered and deficient efforts. A host of activities are undertaken and carried out, but only a few are done well.

Specialization is one remedy and integration is another. Specialization has been much discussed, so my final comments are restricted to integration and further restricted to integration as it applies to the individual professor of educational administration.

The concept of integration in this context implies a harmony or a union of action. It suggests that the work of the individual scholar in theorizing, in conducting empirical studies, in guiding the research of fledgling scholars, in teaching, and in deriving applications to practice should strive for coherence, so that each one of these activities nurtures and is nurtured by the others.[52]

Integration of this sort serves both the individuals who seek it and the field of educational administration. At the same time, a healthy diversity among scholars is preserved. Perhaps we have fumbled the torch, but some well placed candles also can generate light. Hopefully, there will be enough so that we can chart some worthwhile courses.

NOTES

1. "Educational Administration and the Uses of Knowledge," *UCEA Newsletter*, 15 (April 1974); and "Schools, Values and Educational Inquiry," *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 9 (Spring 1973).
2. For a thoughtful statement on changes in educational administration over the past 25 years, see R. F. Campbell, "Educational Administration — A Twenty-Five Year Perspective," *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 8 (Spring 1972).
3. The term is, of course, A. W. Halpin's. See his "Administrative Theory: The Fumbled Torch," in *Issues in American Education*, ed. A. M. Kroll (New York: Oxford University Press, 1970).
4. This topic is beyond the scope of this paper. It is examined in the sources cited in note one, and in my "Educational Change and Functional Equivalents," *Education and Urban Society*, 2 (August 1970); "The Professorship in Educational Administration: A Rationale," in *The Professorship in Educational Administration*, ed. D. J. Willower and J. A. Culbertson (Columbus: University Council for Educational Administration and The Pennsylvania State University, 1964); and "The Form of Knowledge and the Theory-Practice Relationship," *Educational Theory*, 8 (January 1963).
5. H. Feigl, "Operationism and Scientific Method," in *Readings in Philosophical Analysis*, ed. H. Feigl and W. Sellars (New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1949), p. 505.
6. R. K. Merton, *Social Theory and Social Structure*, enlarged ed. (New York: The Free Press, 1968), p. 52. Italics omitted.
7. See G. C. Homans' comment on this point as it applies to sociological theory in "Contemporary Theory in Sociology," in *Handbook of Modern Sociology*, ed. R. E. L. Faris (Chicago: Rand McNally, 1964), p. 956.
8. C. E. Bidwell, "The School as a Formal Organization," in *Handbook of Organizations*, ed. J. G. March (Chicago: Rand McNally, 1965).
9. D. E. Griffiths, "Administrative Theory," in *Encyclopedia of Educational Research*, ed. R. L. Ebel (Toronto: Macmillan, 1969).
10. R. G. Corwin, "Models of Educational Organizations," in *Review of Research in Education*, 2d ed. F. N. Kerlinger and J. B. Carroll (Itasca, Illinois: F. E. Peacock, 1974).
11. Halpin, *op. cit.*, pp. 163-166.
12. J. W. Getzels, J. M. Lipham, and R. F. Campbell, *Educational Administration as a Social Process* (New York: Harper and Row, 1968).
13. Griffiths, *op. cit.*, p. 18.
14. Corwin, *op. cit.*, p. 277.
15. See N. Gross and R. E. Herriott, *Staff Leadership in Public Schools* (New York: Wiley, 1965).
16. One of the earliest studies in educational administration based on role theory was carried out by Gross and his colleagues. See N. Gross, W. S. Mason, and A. W. McEachern, *Explorations in Role Analysis* (New York: Wiley, 1958).
17. See D. J. Willower, T. L. Eidell, and W. K. Hoy, *The School and Pupil Control Ideology*, 2d ed. with an annotated bibliography of pupil control studies (University Park: Penn State Studies no. 24, 1973); and D. J. Willower, "Some Comments on Inquiries on Schools and Pupil Control," *Teachers College Record*, forthcoming.
18. P. A. Cusick, *Inside High School* (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1973; L. Iannaccone and F. W. Lutz, *Politics, Power and Policy: The Governing of Local School Districts* (Columbus: Charles E. Merrill, 1970; L. M. Smith and P. M. Keith, *Anatomy of Educational Innovation* (New York: Wiley, 1971); and H. F. Wolcott, *The Man in the Principal's Office* (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1973).
19. See W. W. Charters, Jr. and others, *The Process of Planned Change in the School's Instructional Organization* (Eugene: Center for the Advanced Study of Educational Administration, 1973).
20. R. O. Carlson, *Adoption of Educational Innovations* (Eugene: Center for the Advanced Study of Educational Administration, 1965).
21. Bidwell, *op. cit.*, p. 974.
22. See, for example, J. G. Anderson, *Bureaucracy in Education* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1968).
23. K. F. Punch, "Bureaucratic Structure in Schools: Towards Redefinition and Measurement," *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 5 (Spring 1969).
24. J. G. March and H. A. Simon, *Organizations* (New York: Wiley, 1958); A. Etzioni, *A Comparative Analysis of Complex Organizations* (Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press, 1961); J. D. Thompson, *Organizations in Action* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1967).
25. J. Walton, *Administration and Policy-Making in Education* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1959).
26. J. H. McGrath, *Planning Systems for School Executives* (Scranton: Intext, 1972).
27. Bidwell, *op. cit.*, p. 972.
28. Corwin, *op. cit.*
29. C. H. Page, "Bureaucracy's Other Face," *Social Forces* 25 (October 1946).
30. For reviews of work in these areas see M. J. Bowman, "Economics of Education," *Review of Educational Research*, 39 (December 1969); and L. Iannaccone and P. J. Cistone, *The Politics of Education* (Eugene: ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Management, University of Oregon, 1974).
31. W. G. Walker, "Theory and Practice in Educational Administration: 1973," paper presented at a Commonwealth Council for Educational Administration Regional Conference, Suva, Fiji, 1973.

32. The exceptions deal with what Corwin called the cybernetic model. See D. E. Griffiths, "Administrative Theory and Change in Organizations," in *Innovation in Education*, ed. M. W. Miles (New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1964) for some systems type propositions applied to educational organizations. McGrath, *op. cit.* also employs a systems orientation. For an extended examination of organizations that is systems based and uses the analogy of the nervous system see S. Beer, *Brain of the Firm* (New York: Herder and Herder, 1972).

33. H. L. Zeterrberg, *On Theory and Verification in Sociology*, rev. ed. (Totowa, New Jersey: The Bedminster Press, 1963).

34. Homans, *op. cit.*

35. E. G. Guba and C. E. Bidwell, *Administrative Relationships* (Chicago: Midwest Administration Center, University of Chicago, 1957), p. 13.

36. See D. J. Willower, "Some Illustrated Comments on Hypothesis Construction and Research," *Journal of Educational Research*, 56 (December 1962).

37. Griffiths, *op. cit.*, p. 21.

38. A. W. Halpin, "A Foggy View from Olympus," *Journal of Educational Administration*, 7 (May 1969); L. Iannaccone, "Interdisciplinary Theory Guided Research in Educational Administration: A Smoggy View from the Valley," *Teachers College Record*, 75 (September 1973).

39. R. F. Campbell and L. J. Newell, *A Study of Professors of Educational Administration* (Columbus: University Council for Educational Administration, 1973), pp. 140-141.

40. The term "critical mass" has been used in this context to refer to a significant number of individuals in one setting at work in a cooperative and supportive mode.

41. Corwin, *op. cit.*

42. Iannaccone, *op. cit.*

43. W. Waller, *The Sociology of Teaching* (New York: Wiley 1932).

44. Homans, *op. cit.*, p. 976.

45. W. W. Charters, Jr., *Measuring the Implementation of Differentiated Staffing* (Eugene: Center for the Advanced Study of Educational Administration, 1973).

46. Iannaccone, *op. cit.*

47. R. L. Mooney, "Training for Research in Educational Administration: A Rationale," in *Educational Research: New Perspectives*, ed. J. A. Culbertson and S. P. Hencley (Danville, Illinois: Interstate, 1963), p. 339.

48. J. Hage, *Techniques and Problems of Theory Construction in Sociology* (New York: Wiley, 1972).

49. See Merton, *op. cit.*, pp. 67-72, 155, and chapter 3.

50. See Hage's comments on synthesis, *op. cit.*, p. 148.

51. A Dutch sociologist recently interviewed 22 American scholars in organizational sociology and suggested on the basis of their comments that trends will include greater interest in macro themes such as the organization in its societal context and interorganizational relations, as well as greater interest in social applications. See C. J. Lammers, "The State of Organizational Sociology in the United States: Travel Impressions by a Dutch Cousin," *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 19 (September 1974).

52. For discussions on the teaching of theory see J. M. Lipham, "Content Selection in Organizational Theory and Behavior in Education," and D. J. Willower, "Educational Administration and Social Science: An Integrative Approach," both in *Social Science Content for Preparing Educational Leaders*, ed. J. Culbertson and others (Columbus: Charles E. Merrill, 1973). In the same source A. R. Crane and W. G. Walker applied criteria of relevance, as distinct from criteria of adequacy, to theory. See "The Selection of Content for a Theory Based Perspective." Another approach is taken by J. G. March who examined the work and skills required of the educational administrator which in turn suggests areas where theories might have particular relevance. See "Analytical Skills and the University Training of Educational Administrators," *Journal of Educational Administration*, 12 (May 1974).